

Nuclear spin-lattice relaxation in ferrimagnetic clusters and chains: A contrast between zero and one dimensions

Hiromitsu Hori and Shoji Yamamoto

Division of Physics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan

(29 April 2003)

Motivated by ferrimagnetic oligonuclear and chain compounds synthesized by Caneschi *et al.*, both of which consist of alternating manganese(II) ions and nitronyl-nitroxide radicals, we calculate the nuclear spin-lattice relaxation rate $1/T_1$ employing a recently developed modified spin-wave theory. $1/T_1$ as a function of temperature drastically varies with the location of probe nuclei in both clusters and chains, though the relaxation time scale is much larger in zero dimension than in one dimension. $1/T_1$ as a function of an applied field in long chains forms a striking contrast to that in finite clusters, diverging with decreasing field like inverse square root at low temperatures and logarithmically at high temperatures.

PACS numbers: 75.50.Xx, 75.50.Gg, 76.50.+g, 75.30.Cr

I. INTRODUCTION

Clusters of metal ions [1] serve to test the validity of quantum mechanical approaches at the nanometer scale. Among others a dodecanuclear manganese complex of formula $[\text{Mn}_{12}\text{O}_{12}(\text{CH}_3\text{COO})_{16}(\text{H}_2\text{O})_4]$ [2] and an octanuclear iron complex of formula $[\text{Fe}_8(\text{N}_3\text{C}_6\text{H}_{15})_6\text{O}_2(\text{OH})_{12}]^{8+}$ [3], which are hereafter abbreviated as Mn_{12} and Fe_8 , respectively, have been attracting considerable interest in this context. In these clusters, magnetic hysteresis curves are independent of temperature and consist of equally separated steps at sufficiently low temperatures [4–7], suggesting quantum tunneling of the magnetization. Both clusters have a magnetic ground state of total spin 10 and are often treated as a rigid spin-10 object with an Ising-type magneto-crystalline anisotropy. Such a phenomenological interpretation is indeed successful for the magnetic relaxation at sufficiently low temperatures and weak fields, but it masks individual internal structures of various magnetic clusters. Without a microscopic Hamiltonian, we could not essentially distinguish the Mn_{12} and Fe_8 clusters. We cannot compare nanomagnets with bulk magnets in the same microscopic language until we describe them in terms of their constituent ion spins.

Thus motivated, several authors made an attempt to

estimate exchange interactions in the Mn_{12} and Fe_8 clusters calculating the low-lying energy spectra [8–10], magnetic susceptibilities [11], magnetization curves [12,13], inelastic neutron-scattering spectra [14], tunneling splittings [15], and nuclear spin-lattice relaxation rates [16]. The 8-spin modeling of the Mn_{12} cluster [14,15] revealed the decisive role of multispin effects in magnetic tunneling, while the extended *ab initio* calculation [10] demonstrated the relevance of metal-ligand orbital hybridization to intramolecular exchange interactions. However, the predicted magnetic structures are rather controversial for both clusters. The Mn_{12} cluster consists of eight Mn^{3+} ions of spin 2 and four Mn^{4+} ions of spin $\frac{3}{2}$, while the Fe_8 cluster contains eight Fe^{3+} ions, both of which are coupled to each other through four kinds of exchange interactions (Fig. 1). Antisymmetric exchange interactions of the Dzyaloshinsky-Moriya type are also assumed to be relevant to the Mn_{12} cluster [14]. There is no established way of assigning the magnetic anisotropy to each ion site. Thus, complicated intracuster magnetic structures block our microscopic understanding of mesoscopic magnetism. Nanomagnets such as Mn_{12} and Fe_8 have indeed been providing fascinating observations but are not necessarily suitable for a comparative study on zero- and one (or higher)-dimensional quantum magnetism.




FIG. 1. Schematic plot of Mn_{12} (a), Fe_8 (b), and $(\text{MnNIT})_6$ (c). Symmetry-inequivalent sites are distinguishably drawn.

In order to reveal how paramagnetic spins grow into bulk magnets, we take a great interest in ferrimagnetic ring clusters [17] and chains [18] synthesized by Caneschi *et al.*, both of which consist of manganese hexafluoroacetylacetonates (hfac) and nitronyl nitroxide radicals 2-*R*-4,4,5,5-tetramethyl-4,5-dihydro-1*H*-imidazolyl-1-oxyl 3-oxide (NIT-*R*) with *R* = phenyl (Ph), isopropyl (*i*-Pr), ethyl (Et), methyl (Me). The [Mn(hfac)NIT-Ph]₆ cluster, hereafter abbreviated as (MnNIT)₆, has antiferromagnetic exchange coupling between the Mn²⁺ ions of spin $\frac{5}{2}$ and the radicals of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ so as to exhibit a magnetic ground state of total spin 12 (Fig. 1). The [Mn(hfac)NIT-*R*]_∞ chain, hereafter abbreviated as (MnNIT)_∞, may be regarded as a one-dimensional analog of (MnNIT)₆. Their simple magnetic structures, describable within isotropic exchange Hamiltonians [17,18], are suitable enough to compare oligonuclear ferrimagnets with those of one dimension in their intrinsic features.

The theoretical tool we employ here is a recently developed modified spin-wave theory, which is quite useful in understanding thermal [19–21] as well as ground-state [22,23] properties of various one-dimensional ferrimagnets. We inquire further into zero dimension and dynamic properties. Besides direct observations of resonant magnetization tunneling, nuclear-magnetic-resonance (NMR) measurements have extensively been performed for cluster magnets. ¹H, ²D, ¹³C, and ⁵⁵Mn NMR in Mn₁₂ [24–28], ¹H and ²D NMR in Fe₈ [29,30], and ¹H NMR in a hexanuclear copper complex [31] significantly contributed toward revealing the quantum dynamics of cluster magnets. As for the systems of Mn(hfac)NIT-*R*, we may consider NMR measurements using as probes ¹H, ¹³C, ¹⁹F, and ⁵⁵Mn nuclei. We calculate the nuclear spin-lattice relaxation rate 1/*T*₁ as a function of temperature, an applied field, and the location of probe nuclei.

II. MODEL HAMILTONIAN

(MnNIT)₆ and (MnNIT)_∞ are both described by an isotropic spin-(*S*, *s*) Heisenberg Hamiltonian [17,18]

$$\mathcal{H} = J \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_i + \mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i+1}) - g\mu_B H \sum_{i=1}^N (S_i^z + s_i^z), \quad (2.1)$$

where $S = \frac{5}{2}$, $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and we have set their *g* factors both equal to *g*. Introducing bosonic operators for the spin deviation in each sublattice via $S_i^+ = (2S - a_i^\dagger a_i)^{1/2} a_i$, $S_i^z = S - a_i^\dagger a_i$, $s_i^+ = b_i^\dagger (2s - b_i^\dagger b_i)^{1/2}$, $s_i^z = -s + b_i^\dagger b_i$, we expand the Hamiltonian with respect to 1/*S* as

$$\mathcal{H} = -2SsJN + \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_0 + O(S^{-1}), \quad (2.2)$$

where we assume that $O(S) = O(s)$ and \mathcal{H}_i is the $O(S^i)$ contribution. Considering the perturbational treatment

of \mathcal{H}_0 to \mathcal{H}_1 , we obtain the diagonal spin-wave Hamiltonian as

$$\mathcal{H} = E_g + \sum_k \left[\omega^-(k) \alpha_k^\dagger \alpha_k + \omega^+(k) \beta_k^\dagger \beta_k \right] + O(S^{-1}), \quad (2.3)$$

with $E_g = -2SsJN + \sum_{i=1,0} E_i$ and $\omega^\pm(k) = \sum_{i=1,0} \omega_i^\pm(k)$, where E_i and $\omega_i^\pm(k)$ are the $O(S^i)$ corrections to the ground-state energy and the dispersion relations, respectively. The dispersions of the linear spin waves, $\omega_1^\pm(k)$, and the corrections due to the interactions between them, $\omega_0^\pm(k)$, are, respectively, given by

$$\omega_1^\pm(k) = [\omega_k \pm (S - s)]J \mp g\mu_B H, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\omega_0^\pm(k) = -2(S + s)J\Gamma_1 \frac{\sin^2(k/2)}{\omega_k} + \frac{J\Gamma_2}{\sqrt{Ss}} [\omega_k \pm (S - s)], \quad (2.5)$$

where $\omega_k = [(S - s)^2 + 4Ss \sin^2(k/2)]^{1/2}$, $\Gamma_1 = -(1/2N) \sum_k [1 - (S + s)/\omega_k]$, and $\Gamma_2 = (1/N) \sum_k (\sqrt{Ss}/\omega_k) \cos^2(k/2)$. Γ_1 is nothing but the quantum spin reduction $(1/N) \sum_i \langle a_i^\dagger a_i \rangle_{T=0} = (1/N) \sum_i \langle b_i^\dagger b_i \rangle_{T=0}$ and can analytically be evaluated as $1/\sqrt{31} + 1/\sqrt{21} - 7/24$ at $N = 6$, which is slightly larger than the $N \rightarrow \infty$ numerical estimate 0.106139 and thus suggests growing quantum fluctuations with decreasing system size. In Fig. 2 we plot the spin-wave dispersions together with quantum Monte Carlo calculations. The lower branch, which reduces the ground-state magnetization, is of ferromagnetic aspect exhibiting a quadratic dispersion at small momenta, whereas the upper branch, which enhances the ground-state magnetization, is of antiferromagnetic aspect being gapped from the ground state. The antiferromagnetic mode is remarkable for its $O(S^0)$ quantum correction.




FIG. 2. Dispersion relations of the linear (LSW) and interacting (ISW) spin waves, $\omega_1^\pm(k)$ and $\omega_1^\pm(k) + \omega_0^\pm(k)$, at $N = 6$ and $N = \infty$ under zero field. Corresponding quantum Monte Carlo calculations (QMC) at $N = 32$ are also shown for reference.




FIG. 3. Magnetic-susceptibility measurements on [Mn(hfac)NIT-Ph]₆ at $H = 0.5$ T [15] and on [Mn(hfac)NIT-*i*-Pr]_∞ at $H = 0$ [16] compared with quantum Monte Carlo calculations (QMC). They are in good agreement assuming $J/k_B \simeq 370$ K for [Mn(hfac)NIT-Ph]₆ and $J/k_B \simeq 360$ K for [Mn(hfac)NIT-*i*-Pr]_∞. Linear (LMSW) and interacting (IMSW) modified spin-wave calculations at $N = \infty$ are also shown.

III. MODIFIED SPIN-WAVE FORMALISM

In order to calculate thermodynamics, we consider modifying the spin-wave scheme [32], that is, controlling the number of bosons induced thermally. For isotropic ferrimagnets, we claim that the thermal fluctuation should cancel the staggered magnetization as [19]

$$(S + s) \sum_k \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \frac{\bar{n}_k^\sigma}{\omega_k} = (S + s)N, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\bar{n}_k^\sigma = \sum_{n^\pm=0}^\infty n^\sigma P_k(n^-, n^+)$ with $P_k(n^-, n^+)$ being the probability of n^- ferromagnetic and n^+ antiferromagnetic spin waves appearing in the k -momentum state. Minimizing the free energy

$$F = E_g + \sum_k \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \bar{n}_k^\sigma \omega_i^\sigma(k) + k_B T \sum_k \sum_{n^\pm} P_k(n^-, n^+) \ln P_k(n^-, n^+), \quad (3.2)$$

with respect to P_k at each k under the condition (3.1) together with the trivial constraints $\sum_{n^\pm} P_k(n^-, n^+) = 1$, we obtain the optimum distribution functions as

$$\bar{n}_k^\pm = \frac{1}{\exp\{[\omega^\pm(k) - \mu(S + s)/\omega_k]/k_B T\} - 1}, \quad (3.3)$$

with a Lagrange multiplier μ due to Eq. (3.1), where the dispersions $\omega^\pm(k)$ are restricted to $\omega_1^\pm(k)$ or set to $\omega_1^\pm(k) + \omega_0^\pm(k)$ according as we consider linear or interacting modified spin waves. In the present formalism, the dispersion relations are determined without modifying the original Hamiltonian (2.2) and then the Lagrange multiplier is introduced so as to construct a reliable thermodynamics, which is essentially different from the Takahashi scheme [32] and enables us to investigate

much wider temperature range. Otherwise the Schottky peak of the specific heat, for instance, can not be reproduced at all [19]. In this context, a mixed Bose-Fermi representation of spin operators [33] may be another useful scheme to thermal calculations.

The magnetic susceptibility is calculated as

$$\chi = \frac{(g\mu_B)^2}{3k_B T} \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \bar{n}_k^\sigma (\bar{n}_k^\sigma + 1), \quad (3.4)$$

and is shown in Fig. 3, together with quantum Monte Carlo calculations at $N = 32$, which are almost the long-chain-limit behavior. Modified spin-wave calculations well agree to the numerical findings, covering the low-temperature region to be hardly reached numerically. The decreasing behavior turns increasing for $k_B T \gtrsim 3J$. A minimum in the susceptibility-temperature product is one of the most remarkable features of ferrimagnets. The ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic terms $\bar{n}_k^\mp (\bar{n}_k^\mp + 1)$ in Eq. (3.4), respectively, contribute increasing and decreasing behaviors with increasing temperature. Since the ferromagnetic (antiferromagnetic) features are predominant for $S > 2s$ ($S < 2s$) [34], the present cases with $(S, s) = (\frac{5}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ are rather biased ferromagnetically. In order to evaluate the exchange coupling constants in the Mn(hfac)NIT-*R* systems, we further compare quantum Monte Carlo calculations with experimental findings. The susceptibility measurements on [Mn(hfac)NIT-Ph]₆ at $H = 0.5$ T [17] and those on [Mn(hfac)NIT-*i*-Pr]_∞ under no field [18] are also plotted in Fig. 3, taking J/k_B to be 370 K and 360 K, respectively. Carrying out semiclassical calculations, Caneschi *et al.* [18] estimated J/k_B for [Mn(hfac)NIT-*R*]_∞ as 474.5 K ($R = i$ -Pr), 373.3 K ($R = Et$), 311.8 K ($R = Me$), and 299.5 K ($R = Ph$). However, smaller values are obtained through a Fischer's model [35]. As for [Mn(hfac)NITPh]₆, no quantitative assignment of J has been given so far. The present estimates will contribute toward establishing the standard.

IV. NUCLEAR SPIN-LATTICE RELAXATION

NMR measurements on isotropic magnets are necessarily performed with an applied field. An induced Zeeman energy gap is usually smaller than the exchange interaction but larger than the nuclear energy scale: $10^5 \hbar \omega_N \lesssim 10^2 g \mu_B H \lesssim J$. Considering the electronic-nuclear energy-conservation requirement, the Raman process should play a leading role in the nuclear spin-lattice relaxation [36]. The Raman relaxation rate is generally given by

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{4\pi \hbar (g\mu_B \gamma_N)^2}{\sum_n e^{-E_n/k_B T}} \sum_{n,m} e^{-E_n/k_B T} \times |\langle m | \sum_i (A_i^z S_i^z + a_i^z s_i^z) | n \rangle|^2 \delta(E_m - E_n - \hbar \omega_N), \quad (4.1)$$

where A_j^z and a_j^z are the dipolar coupling constants between the nuclear and electronic spins in the j th unit cell, $\omega_N \equiv \gamma_N H$ is the Larmor frequency of the nuclei with γ_N being the gyromagnetic ratio, and the summation \sum_n is taken over all the electronic eigenstates $|n\rangle$ with energy E_n . Taking account of the significant difference between the electronic and nuclear energy scales, the relaxation rate (4.1) is expressed in terms of modified spin waves as

$$\frac{1}{T_1} \simeq \frac{2\hbar(g\mu_B\gamma_N)^2}{N} \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \times \left[\sum_k |A_0^z \psi^{-\sigma}(k) - a_0^z \psi^\sigma(k)|^2 \bar{n}_k^\sigma (\bar{n}_k^\sigma + 1) \rho^\sigma(k) + \sum_k |A_{2k}^z \psi^{-\sigma}(k) - a_{2k}^z \psi^\sigma(k)|^2 \bar{n}_k^\sigma (\bar{n}_k^\sigma + 1) \rho^\sigma(k) \right], \quad (4.2)$$

where \sum'_k denotes the limited summation $\sum_k - \sum_{k=0,\pi}$, $\psi^\sigma(k) = (S+s)/2[(S-s)^2 + 4Ss \sin^2(k/2)]^{1/2} + \sigma/2$, and A_k^z and a_k^z are the Fourier transforms of the coupling constants, whose k dependences are hereafter assumed to be negligible. A contrast between zero and one dimensions lies in the spectral density $\rho^\sigma(k)$, which originates in the energy-conservation requirement $\delta(E_m - E_n - \hbar\omega_N)$ in Eq. (4.1). In the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, $\rho^\sigma(k)$ is definitely the *differential coefficients* of the dispersion relations, while for small clusters, it is approximately replaced by the *difference quotients*:

$$\rho^\pm(k) = \frac{1}{\left[\frac{d\omega^\pm(k)}{dk} \right]_{k=k_0}} \quad \text{for } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.3a)$$

$$\rho^\pm(k) \simeq \frac{2\pi/N}{|\omega^\pm(k) - \omega^\pm(k - 2\pi/N)|} \quad \text{for } N = O(1), \quad (4.3b)$$

where k_0 as a function of k is given by $\omega^\pm(k_0) - \omega^\pm(k) - \hbar\omega_N = 0$. If we further process Eq. (4.3a) assuming the predominance of $k \simeq 0$ contributions [37] in integrating Eq. (4.2), which is well justified unless temperature and an applied field are sufficiently high and strong, respectively, we obtain an expression

$$\rho^\pm(k) \simeq \frac{1}{2v\sqrt{k^2 + \hbar\omega_N/v}} \quad \text{for } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.4)$$

where $v = [Ss - (S+s)\Gamma_1 + \sqrt{Ss}\Gamma_2]J/2(S-s)$ is the curvature of the dispersion relations at small momenta. Equation (4.4) is in contrast with Eq. (4.3b) in that it depends on an applied field.

Another consideration should be directed to the modified spin-wave scheme in calculating the relaxation rate. For isotropic ferrimagnets with gapless excitations, the constraint (3.1) works so well as not only to suppress the thermal divergence of the boson number but also to give a precise description of the low-temperature thermodynamics [38]. On the other hand, once a field is applied and a gap Δ opens in the electronic energy spectrum, the boson number should exponentially decrease as $\propto e^{-\Delta/k_B T}$ at low temperatures, whereas the constraint still keeps it finite even at $k_B T \ll g\mu_B H$. Then we adjust Eq. (3.1) to the present situation as

$$(S+s) \sum_k \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \frac{\bar{n}_k^\sigma}{\omega_k} = (S+s) N e^{-\Delta/k_B T}. \quad (4.5)$$

This condition smoothly turns into Eq. (3.1) as $H \rightarrow 0$ and the modification is essentially restricted to the sufficiently low-temperature region $k_B T \lesssim \Delta \lesssim 10^{-2}J$.




FIG. 4. The interacting-spin-wave calculations of the temperature dependence of the nuclear spin-lattice relaxation rate with varying location of the probe nuclei at $N = 6$ (the upper three) and $N = \infty$ (the lower three).




FIG. 5. The interacting-spin-wave calculations of the field dependence of the nuclear spin-lattice relaxation rate with varying location of the probe nuclei at $N = 6$ (the upper three) and $N = \infty$ (the lower three).




FIG. 6. The interacting-spin-wave calculations of the nuclear spin-lattice relaxation rate as a function of inverse square root of an applied field with varying location of the probe nuclei at $N = 6$ (the upper two) and $N = \infty$ (the lower two).

Now the relaxation rate is calculated for $(\text{MnNIT})_6$ and $(\text{MnNIT})_\infty$. Besides temperature and an applied field, it may be a function of the location of probe nuclei, which can be described by a parameter $r \equiv A^z/a^z \sim (d_s/d_S)^3$, where d_S and d_s are the distances between the nuclear and electronic spins. Figure 4 shows $1/T_1$ as a function of temperature. The ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic spin waves contribute different temperature dependences to $1/T_1$ and their weights vary with the parameter r . Considering the predominance of the $k \simeq 0$ contributions in Eq. (4.2), at $r \simeq \psi^\sigma(0)/\psi^{-\sigma}(0) = (S/s)^\sigma$, the σ excitation mode hardly mediates the nuclear spin relaxation, in other words, the electronic excitations of σ mode are invisible to the nuclear spins. The temper-

ature dependence of $1/T_1$ is indeed of antiferromagnetic (ferromagnetic) aspect at $r = 1/5$ ($r = 5$), while otherwise it is of mixed aspect. If the probe nuclei are located as $r \simeq 1/5$, the relaxation rate is extremely small. These calculations can be observed by taking different kinds of nuclei as probes, such as ^1H , ^{13}C , ^{19}F , and ^{55}Mn in the present systems. Equation (4.2) is still valid for $r \rightarrow \infty$, which corresponds to ^{55}Mn NMR.

Figure 5 shows $1/T_1$ as a function of an applied field. There appears a clear contrast between zero and one dimensions, where $1/T_1$ is saturated and diverging, respectively, with decreasing temperature and field, as long as the ferromagnetic spin waves are *visible* to the nuclear spins. In finite clusters, any field dependence of $1/T_1$ is necessarily attributed to \bar{n}_k^\pm , which are simply exponential with respect to H , whereas in long chains, $1/T_1$ is more varied with a field, depending on it through both \bar{n}_k^\pm and $\rho^\pm(k)$. Therefore, unless the Zeeman energy becomes comparable to the exchange interaction, $1/T_1$ exhibits little field dependence in finite clusters. In order to bring out their characteristic field dependences more quantitatively, we plot $1/T_1$ as a function of $1/\sqrt{H}$ in Fig. 6. \bar{n}_k^- and $\rho^-(k)$ are both peaked at $k = 0$. More and more weight centers on $k = 0$ with decreasing temperature and field for $N \rightarrow \infty$ in particular. Therefore, at low temperatures, the $N \rightarrow \infty$ k integration in Eq. (4.2) may approximately be replaced by the $k = 0$ contribution, which is in proportion to $1/\sqrt{H}$. Thus, as long as an applied field is moderate, a $1/\sqrt{H}$ -linear behavior is observed at low temperatures. With increasing temperature it turns logarithmic, sloping more gently, due to the k -integration effect. Under strong fields, they are all masked behind the overwhelming Zeeman term $\propto e^{-g\mu_B H/k_B T}$ coming from \bar{n}_k^- . At $r = 1/5$, where only the antiferromagnetic spin

waves are *active* for $1/T_1$, the nuclear spins exhibit extremely slow dynamics. Since \bar{n}_k^+ is not peaked even at low temperatures, there appears no $1/\sqrt{H}$ dependence. With increasing temperature and field, the antiferromagnetic excitation branch lowers in energy and thermally assists the relaxation, ending up with increasing $1/T_1$. *A minimum of $1/T_1$ as a function of H can be observed only when the ferromagnetic spin waves are almost off.* In finite clusters, the discrete spectrum may in principle lead to $1/T_1$ oscillating as a function of H .

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Motivated by inorganic-organic hybrid compounds, $[\text{Mn}(\text{hfac})\text{NIT-Ph}]_6$ and $[\text{Mn}(\text{hfac})\text{NIT-}R]_\infty$, we have demonstrated model calculations of the low-energy spin dynamics in ferrimagnetic clusters and chains. Temperature dependence of $1/T_1$ drastically varies with the location of the nuclei in both compounds, though the relaxation time scale is much larger in zero dimension than in one dimension. There are special points for the nuclei, characterized as $(d_s/d_S)^3 \sim s/S$, where the nuclear spin relaxation can hardly be assisted by the low-lying ferromagnetic excitations of the electronic spins and therefore extremely slow dynamics is observed.

Field dependence of $1/T_1$ in long chains forms a striking contrast to that in finite clusters, diverging with decreasing field at low temperatures. The present observations should be distinguished from the $1/\sqrt{H}$ or $\ln(1/H)$ dependence of diffusion-dominated dynamics [39,40], which originates from transverse spin fluctuations and distinctly appears at high temperatures. In the vicinity of the special points of $(d_s/d_S)^3 \sim s/S$, a minimum of $1/T_1$ as a function of H can be observed.

Besides the $\text{Mn}(\text{hfac})\text{NIT-}R$ systems, there are a series of ferrimagnetic bimetallic chain compounds $MCu(\text{pba})(\text{H}_2\text{O})_3 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ($M = \text{Mn, Ni}$; $\text{pba} = 1,3\text{-propylenebis(oxamato)}$) [41] and $MCu(\text{pbaOH})(\text{H}_2\text{O})_3 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ($M = \text{Fe, Co, Ni}$; $\text{pbaOH} = 2\text{-hydroxy-1,3-propylenebis(oxamato)}$) [42], which are also describable by the Hamiltonian (2.1). Since their exchange coupling constants are much smaller than those of the $\text{Mn}(\text{hfac})\text{NIT-}R$ systems, they are complementary in field-applied measurements. We hope that the present calculations will stimulate further experimental explorations into quantum dynamics on the way from zero- to one-dimensional magnets. Nuclear spin-lattice relaxation-time measurements on $[\text{Mn}(\text{hfac})\text{NIT-Ph}]_6$ and $[\text{Mn}(\text{hfac})\text{NIT-}R]_\infty$ are strongly encouraged.

This work was supported by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology of Japan, and the Nissan Science Foundation.

- [1] D. Gatteschi, A. Caneschi, L. Pardi, and R. Sessoli, *Science* **265**, 1054 (1994).
- [2] T. Lis, *Acta Crystallogr. Sect. B* **36**, 2042 (1980).
- [3] K. Wieghardt, K. Phol, I. Jibril, and G. Huttner, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.* **23**, 77 (1984).
- [4] J. R. Friedman, M. P. Sarachik, J. Tejada, and R. Ziolo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 3830 (1996).
- [5] L. Thomas, F. Lioni, R. Ballou, D. Gatteschi, R. Sessoli, and B. Barbara, *Nature (London)* **383**, 145 (1996).
- [6] C. Sangregorio, T. Ohm, C. Paulsen, R. Sessoli, and D. Gatteschi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 4645 (1997).
- [7] W. Wernsdorfer and R. Sessoli, *Science* **284**, 133 (1999).
- [8] R. Sessoli, H.-L. Tsai, A. R. Schake, S. Wang, J. B. Vincent, K. Folting, D. Gatteschi, G. Christou, and D. N. Hendrickson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **115**, 1804 (1993).
- [9] C. Raghun, I. Rudra, D. Sen, and S. Ramasesha, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 064419 (2001).
- [10] D. W. Boukhvalov, A. I. Lichtenstein, V. V. Dobrovitski, M. I. Katsnelson, B. N. Harmon, V. V. Mazurenko, and V. I. Anisimov, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 184435 (2002).
- [11] C. Delfs, D. Gatteschi, L. Pardi, R. Sessoli, K. Wieghardt, and D. Hanke, *Inorg. Chem.* **323**, 99 (1993).
- [12] A. K. Zvezdin and A. I. Popov, *JETP* **82**, 1140 (1996).
- [13] N. Regnault, Th. Jolicœur, R. Sessoli, D. Gatteschi, and M. Verdaguer, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 054409 (2002).
- [14] M. I. Katsnelson, V. V. Dobrovitski, and B. N. Harmon, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 6919 (1999).
- [15] H. A. De Raedt, A. H. Hams, V. V. Dobrovitski, M. Al-Saqer, M. I. Katsnelson, B. N. Harmon, *J. Magn. Mater.* **246**, 392 (2002).
- [16] S. Yamamoto and T. Nakanishi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 157603 (2002).
- [17] A. Caneschi, D. Gatteschi, J. Laugier, P. Rey, R. Sessoli, and C. Zanchini, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **110**, 2795 (1988).
- [18] A. Caneschi, D. Gatteschi, P. Rey, and R. Sessoli, *Inorg. Chem.* **27**, 1756 (1988); A. Caneschi, D. Gatteschi, J.-P. Renard, P. Rey, and R. Sessoli, *ibid.* **28**, 1976 (1989).
- [19] S. Yamamoto and T. Fukui, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, R14008 (1998); S. Yamamoto, T. Fukui, K. Maisinger, and U. Schollwöck, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **10**, 11033 (1998).
- [20] A. S. Ovchinnikov, I. G. Bostrem, V. E. Sinitsyn, A. S. Boyarchenkov, N. V. Baranov, and K. Inoue, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **14**, 8067 (2002).
- [21] T. Nakanishi and S. Yamamoto, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 214418 (2002).
- [22] S. Brehmer, H.-J. Mikeska, and S. Yamamoto, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **9**, 3921 (1997).
- [23] T. Nakanishi, S. Yamamoto, and T. Sakai, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **70**, 1380 (2001).
- [24] A. Lascialfari, D. Gatteschi, F. Borsa, A. Shastri, Z. H. Jang, and P. Carretta, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 514 (1998); A. Lascialfari, Z. H. Jang, F. Borsa, P. Carretta, and D. Gatteschi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3773 (1998); Z. H. Jang, A. Lascialfari, F. Borsa, and D. Gatteschi, *ibid.* **84**, 2977 (2000).
- [25] D. Arčon, J. Dolinšek, T. Apih, R. Blinc, N. S. Dalal, and R. M. Achey, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, R2941 (1998).
- [26] Y. Furukawa, K. Watanabe, K. Kumagai, Z. H. Jang, A. Lascialfari, F. Borsa, and D. Gatteschi, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**,

- 14246 (2000); Y. Furukawa, K. Watanabe, K. Kumagai, F. Borsa, and D. Gatteschi, *ibid.* **64**, 104401 (2001).
- [27] R. M. Achey, P. L. Kuhns, A. P. Reyes, W. G. Moulton, N. S. Dalal, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 064420 (2001); Solid State Commun. **121**, 107 (2002).
- [28] T. Kubo, T. Goto, T. Koshiha, K. Takeda, and K. Awaga, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 224425 (2002); T. Goto, T. Koshiha, T. Kubo, and K. Awaga, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 104408 (2003).
- [29] Y. Furukawa, K. Kumagai, A. Lascialfari, S. Aldrovandi, F. Borsa, R. Sessoli, and D. Gatteschi, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 094439 (2001).
- [30] M. Ueda, S. Maegawa, and S. Kitagawa, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 073309 (2002).
- [31] Y. Furukawa, A. Lascialfari, Z. H. Jang, and F. Borsa, J. Appl. Phys. **87**, 6265 (2000).
- [32] M. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 168 (1987).
- [33] V. Y. Irkhin, A. A. Katanin, and M. I. Katsnelson, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 1082 (1999).
- [34] S. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 1024 (1999).
- [35] M. E. Fischer, Am. J. Phys. **32**, 343 (1964).
- [36] D. Beeman and P. Pincus, Phys. Rev. **166**, 359 (1968).
- [37] S. Yamamoto, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **69**, 2324 (2000); Solid State Commun. **117**, 1 (2001).
- [38] S. Yamamoto, T. Fukui, and T. Sakai, Eur. Phys. J. B **15**, 211 (2000).
- [39] D. Hone, C. Scherer, and F. Borsa, Phys. Rev. B **9**, 965 (1974); J.-P. Boucher, M. A. Bakheit, M. Nechtschein, M. Villa, G. Bonera, and F. Borsa, Phys. Rev. B **13**, 4098 (1976).
- [40] Y. Ajiro, Y. Nakajima, Y. Furukawa, and H. Kiriya, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **44**, 420 (1978).
- [41] Y. Pei, M. Verdaguer, O. Kahn, J. Sletten, and J.-P. Renard, Inorg. Chem. **26**, 138 (1987).
- [42] P. J. van Koningsbruggen, O. Kahn, K. Nakatani, Y. Pei, and J.-P. Renard, Inorg. Chem. **29**, 3325 (1990).